

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 12-28 and 30 remain in the application. Claims 12-28 and 30 are subject to examination.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 12-22, 25-28, and 30 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,034,995 to Eisele et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,124,990 to Williamson under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 12 includes a step of "carrying out a check for a line fault by a bus subscriber only when the bus subscriber is placed in the dominant state by the switches". The Examiner has recognized that Eisele et al. do not teach such a step. The Examiner has alleged that Williamson teach such a step and that it would have been obvious to have incorporated the step taught in Williamson into the teaching of Eisele et al.

Applicant respectfully believes that when one considers the teachings in the prior art as a whole, as is required, the invention as defined by claim 12 would not have been suggested. Eisele et al. teach a data bus that includes two data lines 11 and 12. All stations 1, 2, 3 or subscribers are connected in parallel to

the data lines 11 and 12 such that the data is simultaneously transmitted from one subscriber to all of the other subscribers connected in parallel to the data lines 11, 12. Williamson, however, does not teach a transmission bus in which the data is transmitted simultaneously to all subscribers connected in parallel to the data lines. Williamson teaches a bidirectional ring configuration 500 with a plurality of data bus portions 510AB, 510BC, 510CA located between the subscribers 502 in which data can be transmitted sequentially. The sequential transmission occurs, for example, from one subscriber 502A to the next subscriber 502B and then to the next subscriber 502C along the ring 500 (See Fig. 5). Williamson places only one segment of the serial data bus 510AB, 510BC, or 510CA in the dominant state in order to check only the segment of the data bus 510AB, 510BC, or 510CA that is in the dominant state (See Fig. 6 and column 4, line 55 through column 5, line 19).

Not only are there differences in topology between the two different types of networks, but there are differences in protocols, and in the general operation of a ring network with respect to a network in which all of the subscribers are connected in parallel to the data bus. Because of these differences, applicant believes that one of ordinary skill in the art concerned with designing a parallel data bus, such as that taught by Eisele et al., would not even refer to a teaching of a ring network, such as that taught by Williamson, where the data is transmitted along the ring from one subscriber to the next subscriber on the ring.

Further, even if one of ordinary skill in the art concerned with designing a parallel data bus, did consider the teaching of Williamson, applicant believes it would not have been obvious to have incorporated the teaching in Williamson into that of Eisele et al. This is the case because Williamson tests one half of a bidirectional portion of a data bus that is located between the receiver of one subscriber of a ring network and the transmitter of another subscriber of the ring network, and it would not have been obvious to have incorporated that teaching into a parallel data bus, such as, that taught by Eisele et al. The data bus in Eisele et al. does not have discrete portions located only between a particular receiver and a particular transmitter. Rather, the data bus in Eisele et al. is connected to all subscribers. Inventive and creative thought would have been needed to even contemplate applying a feature of a ring network to a parallel data bus.

The invention as defined by claim 12 would not have been suggested when one considers the teachings in the prior art as a whole in order to determine what fairly would have been suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim 18 defines a bus with at least one fault identification device configured to carry out a check for a line fault only when the one of said bus subscribers is placed in the dominant state by said switching state of said switches. Claim 30 defines a bus at least one fault identification device connected to at least said transceiver and carrying out: a check for a line fault only when the at least one

of said bus subscribers is placed in said dominant state by said switching state of said switches.

Referring to the limitations of claims 18 and 30 copied above, it is seen that the discussion provided with regard to claim 12 is also applicable to claims 18 and 30.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 15 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 23 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,034,995 to Eisele et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,124,990 to Williamson in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,516,248 to Barclay et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant believes that even if the teaching in the additional prior art were considered, the invention as defined by claim 23 would not have been suggested for the reasons given above with regard to claim 18 and the teachings in Eisele et al. and Williamson.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 16 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 24 has have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,034,995 to Eisele et a. and U.S. Patent No. 5,124,990 to Williamson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,028 to Baker under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant believes that even if the teaching in the additional prior art were considered, the invention as defined by claim 24 would not have been suggested for the reasons given above with regard to claim 18 and the teachings in Eisele et al. and Williamson.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 12, 18, or 30. Claim 12, 18, and 30 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 12 or 18.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 12-28 and 30 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Appl. No. 10/694,592
Reply to Office Action of February 1, 2010
Amdt. Dated April 30, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/
Mark P. Weichselbaum
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

April 30, 2010

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101